

## REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed on November 10, 2005, claims 1-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chern. The § 102 rejections are discussed below.

### § 102 Rejections of Claims 1-25:

As amended, the system of independent claim 1 includes a mobile unit to acquire information about a region near the mobile unit other than a location of the mobile unit. The mobile unit also determines the location of the mobile unit and automatically labels the information with the location of the mobile unit.

Contrary to the limitations of amended independent claim 1, Chern merely describes a wireless system in which a mobile telephone device transmits its location to a web server. Chern describes different applications of this arrangement, such as allowing the mobile telephone device to transmit its location to the web server so that the web server may communicate driving directions back to the mobile telephone device. *See, for example,* Chern, 3:64-6:9. Chern also describes an arrangement in which Internet users may request the location of a mobile telephone device, and in response to such a request from an authorized user, the mobile telephone device unit transmits its location back to the web server, which reports the location to the requesting user. *See, for example,* Chern, 6:10-7:41.

However, Chern fails to teach or even suggest a mobile unit that automatically labels information acquired about a region near the mobile unit (other than a location of the unit) with the location of the mobile unit. The Examiner refers to the language in lines 11-20 in column 6 of Chern to allegedly teach a mobile unit acquiring information about a region near the mobile unit. However, the cited language describes an option in which a user of the telephone device decides whether or not to publish the location of the telephone device. Thus, this cited language fails to teach or suggest a mobile unit acquiring information about a region near the mobile unit other than a location of the mobile unit. Additionally, to support the contention that Chern allegedly teaches automatically labeling the acquired information with the location of the mobile unit, the Examiner refers to lines 40-54 in column 6 of Chern. However, the cited language merely describes the mobile telephone device automatically continuously sending its location to a web server. The language does not, however, teach or even suggest automatically labeling information acquired about a region near a mobile unit (other than a location of the mobile unit)

with the location of the mobile unit. As such, Chern fails to teach or suggest a mobile unit to automatically label acquired information about a region near the mobile unit with the location of the mobile unit.

Therefore, for at least any of the reasons that are set forth above, Chern fails to anticipate independent claim 1. Claims 2-25 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

§ 102 Rejections of Claims 26-31:

As amended, the system of independent claim 26 includes mobile units. Each mobile unit acquires information about a different region near the mobile unit other than a location of the mobile unit. Each mobile unit also determines the location of the mobile unit and automatically labels the information near the mobile unit with the location of the mobile unit.

See discussion of independent claim 1 above. Chern fails to teach or suggest a mobile that automatically labels information acquired about a region near the mobile unit (other than the unit's location) with the location of the mobile unit. Therefore, for at least this reason, Chern fails to anticipate independent claim 26.

Claims 27-31 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

§ 102 Rejections of Claims 32-40:

The method of independent claim 32, as amended, recites using a mobile unit to acquire information about a region near the mobile unit (other than a location of the mobile unit) and automatically labeling the information with the location of the mobile unit.

See discussion of independent claim 1 above. For at least the reason that Chern fails to teach or suggest the act of automatically labeling as set forth in independent claim 32, Chern fails to anticipate this claim.

Claims 33-40 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

§ 102 Rejections of Claims 41-48:

As amended, the method of independent claim 41 includes for each mobile unit, using the mobile unit to acquire information about a different region near the mobile unit other than a

location of the mobile unit. The method includes for each mobile unit, automatically labeling the information that is acquired by the mobile unit with the location of the mobile unit.


See discussion of independent claim 1 above. For at least the reason that Chern fails to teach or even suggest the automatic labeling that is set forth in independent claim 41, Chern fails to anticipate this claim.

Claims 42-48 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the § 102 rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance are requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (NTC.0003US).

Respectfully submitted,



Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Reg. No. 40,779  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 KATY FREEWAY, SUITE 100  
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Date: February 10, 2006